IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.SIRI JAGAN

TUESDAY, THE 31ST JULY 2007 / 9TH SRAVANA 1929

WP(C).No. 21672 of 2007(E)

PETITIONERS:
----

1. **SUNIL KUMAR KURIAKOSE,S/O.KURIAKOSE K.A.**
   AGED 29 YEARS, KOORAN HOUSE, CHENGAMANAD P.O.,
   PIN-683 578, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.

2. **VARGHESE MATHEW, S/O. I.M.MATHEW,**
   AGED 25 YEARS, ILLIKKAL HOUSE, LEGANATH WARD,
   ALAPPUZHA, PIN-688 001.

3. **SANEESH KUNJUKUNJU, S/O. M.D.PETER,**
   AGED 27 YEARS, MAMPILLIL HOUSE, VADAKARA P.O.,
   THALAYOLAPARAMBU, PIN-686 605.

4. **REJANISH K.V., S/O. K.B.VENUGOPALAN,**
   KARUMPILLIL HOUSE, AGED 26 YEARS, NETTOOR P.O.,
   (SOUTH END), PIN-682 304, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.

5. **GOPAKUMAR N.M., S/O. MOHANAN N.C.,**
   NAYINGANA PARAMBIL HOUSE, AGED 28 YEARS,
   PUTHUVAIPPU P.O., PIN-682 508.

6. **SABITHA B.MATHEW, D/O. BABY M.MATHEW,**
   AGED 23 YEARS, II-A (R.P.S.), L.I.G.FLATS,
   NEAR PRESS COLONY, MAYAKUNJ, MAYAPURI, NEW DELHI.

7. **RUJITHA T.R., AGED 23 YEARS,**
   D/O. T.K.RAVINDRAN, THANNATHU PARAMBIL,
   THAMMANAM P.O., COCHIN-32.

8. **INDU P.RAJ, D/O. R.DEVARAJAN,**
   AGED 24 YEARS, 55/575, KALATHIPARAMBIL ROAD,
   KOCHI-682 016.

9. **VIDHYA A.KRISHNAN, D/O. T.S.KRISHNAN,**
   AGED 24 YEARS, PULOOKAVUNGAL HOUSE,
   EDAPPALLY P.S., KOCHI-24.

10. SREELATHA P.V., D/O. P.K.VASUDEVAN,
PUTHENPARAMBA, THAKAZHY, ALAPPUZHA.

BY ADV. SRI.P.SANJAY
SRI.A.PARVATHI MENON

RESPONDENTS:
---

1. THE VICE CHANCELLOR,
MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY, KOTTAYAM.

2. THE CONTROLLER OF EXAMINATIONS,
MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY, KOTTAYAM.

3. THE PRINCIPAL,
GOVT. LAW COLLEGE, ERNAKULAM.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.I.V.PRAMOD
SRI.T.A.SHAJI, (SC)

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 31/07/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

S.SIRI JAGAN,J

==========

W.P.(C).No.21672 of 2007

==========

Dated this the 31st day of July 2007

JUDGMENT

Petitioners are students of the 4th semester LLB three year course of the Government Law College, Ernakulam. Their 4th semester examination was scheduled to be conducted on 24.11.2006. The petitioners alleges that since they were prevented from writing the examination by other students they could not write that examination on that day. None of the students of the college wrote the examination also. Although the petitioners expected that the examination would be rescheduled, the University took a stand that no reexamination would be conducted. In the above circumstances petitioners approached this Court with this writ petition seeking a direction to the University to permit the petitioners to write the examination along with the 8th semester students of the five year course since both examinations are identical. When it was pointed out that the schemes of the two examinations are different and students of one scheme cannot be allowed write examination of the other

scheme, the petitioners sought a direction to the University to conduct a supplementary examination. The learned standing counsel for the University submits that since in semester systems no supplementary examination are being conducted and petitioners have to write the next regular examination which would be conducted as far as possible within another two months. This is recorded and the writ petition is closed.

S.SIRI JAGAN, JUDGE

dvs